

The proposed conservation of the names *Ixodes angustus* Neumann, 1899 and *I. woodi* Bishopp, 1911, involving replacement of the holotype of *I. angustus* by the neotype proposed by Robbins & Keirans in keeping with accustomed usage, should be supported as the most expedient solution to the taxonomic problem raised by their observation that the holotypes of these nominally different species appear to be conspecific, whereas these two names have always been used unambiguously for two biologically distinct tick species of some medico-veterinary importance.

Additional reference

Harbach, R.E., Dahl, C. & White, G.B. 1985. *Culex* (*Culex*) *pipiens* Linnaeus (Diptera: Culicidae): concepts, type designations, and description. *Proceedings of the Entomological Society of Washington*, 87: 1-24.

Comments on the conservation of the spelling of the specific name of *Macrocheles robustulus* (Berlese, 1904) (Arachnida, Acarina)

(Case 2725; see BZN 47: 24-26)

The proposed ruling that the accepted spelling of the specific name of the mite *Macrocheles robustulus* (Berlese, 1904) be deemed correct although it was first published as '*rubustulus*' has been supported in letters received from 31 persons: Richard C. Axtell (*North Carolina, U.S.A.*); Gerald T. Baker (*Mississippi, U.S.A.*); A.K. Datta (*Assam, India*); R.M. Emberson (*Canterbury, New Zealand*); G.P. Hall (*Western Australia*); Robert D. Hall (*Missouri, U.S.A.*); W. Hirschmann (*Nürnberg, Fed. Rep. Germany*); T.M. Ho (*Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia*); E. Holm (*New South Wales, Australia*); Robert W. Husband (*Michigan, U.S.A.*); K.H. Hyatt (*Wales, U.K.*); H. Koehler (*Bremen, Fed. Rep. Germany*); G.W. Krantz (*Oregon, U.S.A.*); E.E. Lindquist (*Ontario, Canada*); M. Luxton (*Liverpool, England*); W. Niedbala (*Poznan, Poland*); Roy A. Norton (*New York, U.S.A.*); James H. Oliver, Jr. (*Georgia, U.S.A.*); J.C. Otto (*Bremen, Fed. Rep. Germany*); F. Pegazzano (*Firenze, Italy*); G.W. Ramsay (*Auckland, New Zealand*); M.K.P. Smith Meyer (*Pretoria, South Africa*); R.V. Southcott (*South Australia*); M. Spear (*Pennsylvania, U.S.A.*); Victor F. Stanis (*Pennsylvania, U.S.A.*); G. Takaku (*Sapporo, Japan*); P.D. Theron (*Potchefstroom, South Africa*); M.B. Usher (*York, England*); M.M.H. Wallace (*Canberra, Australia*); D.E. Walker (*Florida, U.S.A.*); F.E. Wendt (*Bremen, Fed. Rep. Germany*).

Comment on the proposed conservation of *Bathynomus* A. Milne Edwards, 1879 (Crustacea, Isopoda)

(Case 2721; see BZN 47: 27-29)

Jacques Forest

Muséum National d'Histoire Naturelle, 61 rue de Buffon, 75231 Paris, France

Je me permets d'apporter un appui total à la proposition présentée par Martin & Kuck, visant à conserver le nom de *Bathynomus*, établi pour un genre d'Isopode par A. Milne Edwards en 1879 et menacé par une mise en synonymie récente avec le genre fossile *Palaega* Woodward, 1870.

Je suis tout à fait d'accord avec l'argumentation des deux auteurs de la requête, retenant deux points principaux:

1. La synonymie des deux genres est douteuse.
2. Le nom de *Bathynomus* a été appliqué de façon continue à un nombre croissant d'espèces et son emploi est habituel dans la littérature carcinologique.

Dans l'intérêt de la stabilité de la nomenclature, je souhaite vivement que la Commission préserve l'usage de *Bathynomus*.

Comments on the proposed designation of *Lysianax cubensis* Stebbing, 1897 as the type species of *Shoemakerella* Pirlot, 1936 (Crustacea, Amphipoda)

(Case 2711; see BZN 46: 236–238)

(1) Richard C. Brusca

Natural History Museum, P.O. Box 1390, San Diego, California 92112, U.S.A.

I would like to state briefly my support for the proposition of Lowry & Stoddart favoring the designation of the nominal species *Lysianax cubensis* Stebbing, 1897 as the type species of *Shoemakerella* Pirlot, 1936. I believe Lowry & Stoddart are correct in their assessment of the situation, and that other amphipod workers would welcome this official clarification of a long-standing problem.

(2) Michael H. Thurston

Institute of Oceanographic Sciences, Deacon Laboratory, Godalming, Surrey GU8 5UB, U.K.

I support the case made for the designation of *L. cubensis* as the type species of *Shoemakerella*.

It is clear that Pirlot (1936) based his concept of *Shoemakerella* on his own material and on the specimens received from Shoemaker. The separation of *L. nasuta* and *L. cubensis* is valid. While the illustrations provided by Dana lack much of the detail required by modern taxonomists, such detail as is given can be relied upon. The structure of uropod 3 provides an unequivocal separation of the two species.

(3) Support for the proposals on BZN 46: 237 was also received from Prof Krzysztof Jazdzewski, Uniwersytet Łódzki, Łódź, Poland.

Comments on the proposed conservation of the specific name of *Curculio viridicollis* Fabricius, 1792 (currently *Phyllobius viridicollis*; Insecta, Coleoptera)

(Case 2678; see BZN 46: 241–243)

(1) M.A. Alonso-Zarazaga

Sección de Entomología, Museo Nacional de Ciencias Naturales, J. Gutierrez Abascal 2, 28006 Madrid, Spain

I cannot support the application to conserve Fabricius's specific name *viridicollis*. We (entomologists and biologists in general) should be prepared to handle synonymies,